APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,184	07/10/2001	Robert Craig Murphy	07099.1529	7537

826   7590   03/03/2008
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER
LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/902,184	MURPHY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANH LY	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 November 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-47</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-47</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/20/2007</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20080228

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is response to Applicants' AMENDMENT filed on 11/28/2007.

2.   Claims 1-47 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments are moot in view of moot in view of the new ground(s) of

rejection.

Applicants' argued that, Walker' 534 does not teach or suggest or disclose

receiving identifying information on the customer from an electronic storage containing

information about the customer ..." (page 13, 11-13, in the remark).

Examiner respectfully disagrees as argued. In response to Applicants arguments,

the cited reference Walker et al. (6,134,534) teaches a plurality of data storage devices

storing the client or customer information for central reservation system and airlines

reservation system data, each data source or database containing identifying

information for each client or customer including customer ID or customer identifier from

which it is used to identify a particular customer or entity associated with customer

database; also customer detail is used to describe the customer identified by customer

identifier. Walker also teaches ID number of customer is utilized as cross-reference the

corresponding information for the stored customer in the customer database between

the reservation systems. (see fig. 1, item 200 and 400, col. 8, lines 36-45 and col. 10,

lines 18-35).

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action

was proper.

Claim Objections

4.   Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities: The dependency

of claim 2 should be 25 not by itself. Thus, the first line of claim 26, "The method

according to claim 26" should be replaced with "The method according to claim 25".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7.   Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 16-20, 22-29, 32-36, 40-43 and 47 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.: 6,134,534 issued to Walker et

al. (hereinafter Walker) in view of Pub. No. US 2002/0100802 A1 to SEHR (Provisional

Application No.: 60/050,648, filed on Jun 24, 1997).

With respect to claim 1, Walker teaches a method for sharing customer

information among a plurality of electronic facilities (a method for CPO management

central server accessing the shared customer data storing at data storage devices: fig.

2 and col. 9, lines 60-67), comprising:

providing a mass data store comprising in a first data record identifying

information for a customer having an associated first customer identifier (via airline

reservation system as shown in fig. 5b);

receiving identifying information on the customer from an electronic storage

facility containing information about the customer including a second customer identifier

that is different from the first customer identifier (the CPO (Conditional Purchase Offer)

database preferably stores an indication of the total number of passengers traveling

together, and sets forth the price the customer is willing to pay per ticket. Any other

miscellaneous restrictions specified by the customer will be recorded, such as preferred

airline(s), flights, or seat assignments. Recording the current status of the respective

CPO, such as pending, accepted, rejected or expired. Finally, if the CPO ultimately

results in a ticket being booked for the customer, the Passenger Name Record number

(PNR) associated with the ticket is stored in the record. Generally, a PNR is a record

stored by the CRS (Central Reservation System) containing information for each

ticketed passenger, including: record number, passenger name(s), address for ticketing,

billing information, such as credit card number, carrier(s) and flight number(s) for all

segments, seat assignments, inventory class, aircraft type, airline-issued authorization

code for discounted fare, selling price, and additional comments. Thus, in such an

alternate or supplemental embodiment, prior to accessing the inventory database, the

CPO management system 100 will preferably query the CRS to identify possible flights

which satisfy the customer's itinerary restrictions. Thereafter, the CPO management

system will access the inventory database to determine if the airline has released any

inventory on such identified flights to the CPO management system for sale to CPO

customers. In one embodiment, the list of identified flights from the CRS can be

sequenced to optimize customer preferences, and the inventory database can be

searched in the order of the sequenced list of flights, until available inventory is

identified. Finally, if any available inventory satisfying the customer's itinerary is

identified, then the CPO management system will access the pricing database to

determine if the price specified by the customer exceeds the minimum price defined by

the airline, pricing database: customer database containing a plurality of customers or

passenger's data record including identifying information for each individual customer

stored in the customer database: see figs. 1, 4 and 6 col. 14, lines 5-18, col. 15, lines

30-47 and col. 17, lines 5-25);

storing the received identifying information in a second data record (a customer

database, airline database or flight database or CPO database stored the client or

customer information, identifying information of the customers or clients who registered

for the cruise or airline reservation system with the same name but different ID number:

see figs. 6-10s);

assigning an identifier based on a result of the determination (each client is

assigned an identifier based on the stored database: such as customer ID or CPO ID for

CPO customer: col. 13, lines 8-25);

cross-referencing the assigned identifier with identifying information stored in the

first and second data records (the CPO database identifies the customer by name

(primary passenger name), and by identification number (customer ID) and identifies

any companion passengers. The ID number stored in companion passengers is

preferably utilized to cross-reference the corresponding information stored for the

customer in the customer database (see fig. 9a, item 935, 940 and 945, col. 15, lines

12-17); and

providing identifying information using the assigned identifier on an electronic

storage facility (see figs. 6-7, col. 14, lines 5-32).

Walker teaches a plurality of data storage devices storing the client or customer

information for central reservation system and airlines reservation system data, each

data source or database containing identifying information for each client or customer

including customer ID or customer identifier from which it is used to identify a particular

customer or entity associated with customer database; also customer detail is used to

describe the customer identified by customer identifier. Walker also teaches ID number

of customer is utilized as cross-reference the corresponding information for the stored

customer in the customer database between the reservation systems. Walker does not

clearly teach determining that the identifying information in the first and the second data

records are associated with the customer.

However, SEHR teaches passenger ID number and passenger's SSN: identifying

information in the records that are associated the same customer. The passenger's

demographics data such as name, address, birth date, and telephone number;

cardholder identification information such as a passenger ID number, SSN (Social

Security Number), or check guarantee number; and an electronic representation of

cardholder documents such as a driver's license, identity card, or passport. Also stored

are the overall terms and conditions the passenger card has to conform to when being

used, data and information about the card's eligibility for a particular itinerary or a

specific application/service, information about the card utilization including services

rendered and travel performed via the passenger card, and the passenger's

credit history including approvals or declines of card-based payment

transactions or fund transfers. The stored background data elements comprise

plain data that can be displayed and modified by all system users, restricted

information that can be accessed or manipulated only by an authorized entity or

by the cardholder, and certified data that can be retrieved and viewed but

changed only by the certification center. Data and information can also be

inputted into the background-field, including the instruction-window, after the

passenger card is issued. For example, a cardholder can enter additional data,
such as time management information to tailor the card for a particular card
utilization purpose, or a issuer of card-based documents can update the
document-related data, such as a license or an immunization pass with new
information (paragraphs 0052 and 0070).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at
the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Walker with the teachings of
SEHR. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the
use of determining that identifying information of the first and the second of the same
customer as disclosed (SEHR's paragraph 0052), into the system of Walker for the
purpose of storage and processing of data and information, identification and
authentication schemes, as well as for hosting a traveler's pass, payment and a plurality
of application-specific traveling services, and the convenience of using the same
passenger card for transportation, identification, card-based payment means, and for
other travel-related applications and services, thereby, enabling the agent/officer to
verify passengers and use rights will be consolidated (SEHR's paragraphs 0008 and
0010).

With respect to claim 2, Walker teaches retrieving identifying information from
the master data store based on an identifier (col. 15, lines 30-45).

With respect to claim 5, Walker teaches wherein determining comprises:

standardizing the received identifying information and comparing the standardized

identifying information to existing data in the master data store (col. 7, lines 65-67 and

col. 8, lines 1-25).

With respect to claim 6, Walker teaches wherein cross-referencing comprises:

creating a record in a table having a first and second field wherein the first field stores

the assigned identifier and the second filed stores the identifying information (CPO

database record having the first filed is primary passenger name and the second field is

customer ID: fig 9a, item 935 and 940).

Claim 7 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer

for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same

reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a computer

for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same

reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a

computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the

same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a

computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the

same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system

for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same

reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system

for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same

reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system

for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same

reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a system

for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same

reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 19, Walker teaches a system for sharing customer

information among a plurality of electronic storage facilities (a method for CPO

management central server accessing the shared customer data storing at data storage

devices: fig. 2 and col. 9, lines 60-67), comprising:

a plurality of electronic storage facilities for storing customer information

associated with and identifying a customer; a mass data store comprising in a first data

record identifying information for the customer having an associated first customer

identifier; and an information system for receiving customer information from an

electronic storage facility, said information system capable of: receiving identifying

information on the customer from an electronic storage facility containing information on

the customer including a second customer identifier that is different from the first

customer identifier (see figs. 1, 4 and 6 col. 14, lines 5-18, col. 15, lines 30-47 and col.

17, lines 5-25); storing the received identifying information in a second data record;

assigning an identifier for the customer based on a result of the determination; and

providing identifying information using the assigned identifier to an electronic storage

facility (via airline reservation system as shown in fig. 5b; fig. 6, customer database

containing a plurality of customers or passenger's data record including identifying

information for each individual customer stored in the customer database: col. 14, lines

5-18; a customer database, airline database or flight database or CPO database stored

the client or customer information, identifying information of the customers or clients

who registered for the cruise or airline reservation system with the same name but

different ID number: see figs. 6-10s; each client is assigned an identifier based on the

stored database: such as customer ID or CPO ID for CPO customer: col. 13, lines 8-25;

and see figs. 6-7, col. 14, lines 5-32) and cross-referencing the identifier with identifying

information stored in the first and second data records within the master data store (the

CPO database identifies the customer by name (primary passenger name), and by

identification number (customer ID) and identifies any companion passengers. The ID

number stored in companion passengers is preferably utilized to cross-reference the

corresponding information stored for the customer in the customer database (see fig.

9a, item 935, 940 and 945, col. 15, lines 12-17).

Walker teaches a plurality of data storage devices storing the client or customer

information for central reservation system and airlines reservation system data, each

data source or database containing identifying information for each client or customer

including customer ID or customer identifier from which it is used to identify a particular

customer or entity associated with customer database; also customer detail is used to

describe the customer identified by customer identifier. Walker also teaches ID number

of customer is utilized as cross-reference the corresponding information for the stored

customer in the customer database between the reservation systems. Walker does not

clearly teach determining that the identifying information in the first and the second data

records are associated with the customer.

However, SEHR teaches passenger ID number and passenger's SSN: identifying

information in the records that are associated the same customer. The passenger's

demographics data such as name, address, birth date, and telephone number;

cardholder identification information such as a passenger ID number, SSN (Social

Security Number), or check guarantee number; and an electronic representation of

cardholder documents such as a driver's license, identity card, or passport. Also stored

are the overall terms and conditions the passenger card has to conform to when being

used, data and information about the card's eligibility for a particular itinerary or a

specific application/service, information about the card utilization including services

rendered and travel performed via the passenger card, and the passenger's

credit history including approvals or declines of card-based payment

transactions or fund transfers. The stored background data elements comprise

plain data that can be displayed and modified by all system users, restricted

information that can be accessed or manipulated only by an authorized entity or

by the cardholder, and certified data that can be retrieved and viewed but

changed only by the certification center. Data and information can also be

inputted into the background-field, including the instruction-window, after the

passenger card is issued. For example, a cardholder can enter additional data,

such as time management information to tailor the card for a particular card

utilization purpose, or a issuer of card-based documents can update the

document-related data, such as a license or an immunization pass with new

information (paragraphs 0052 and 0070).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Walker with the teachings of

SEHR. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the

use of determining that identifying information of the first and the second of the same

customer as disclosed (SEHR's paragraph 0052), into the system of Walker for the

purpose of storage and processing of data and information, identification and

authentication schemes, as well as for hosting a traveler's pass, payment and a plurality

of application-specific traveling services, and the convenience of using the same

passenger card for transportation, identification, card-based payment means, and for

other travel-related applications and services, thereby, enabling the agent/officer to

verify passengers and use rights will be consolidated (SEHR's paragraphs 0008 and

0010).

With respect to claim 20, Walker teaches wherein said information system is further configured to: retrieve customer information from the master data store based on the identifier (col. 15, lines 30-45).

With respect to claim 22, Walker teaches wherein said information system cross-references the identifier with the customer information by creating a record in a table within the master data store having first and second fields, wherein the first filed stores the identifier and the second filed stores the customer information (CPO database record having the first filed is primary passenger name and the second field is customer ID: fig 9a, item 935 and 940).

Claim 23 is essentially the same as claim 19 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 19 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 24, Walker teaches wherein when said information system receives an inquiry for information associated with a customer, said information system provides information indicating which electronic storage facilities contain information related to the customer and the identification used by each electronic facility to identify the customer's information (col. 15, lines 30-45; also col. 14, lines 5-18; and col. 22, lines 8-35 and col. 23, lines 1-8).

Claim 25 is essentially the same as claim 23 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 23 hereinabove.

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 24 except that it is directed to a system

for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same

reason as applied to the claim 24 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 27, Walker teaches wherein the first and second data

records comprise identifying information identifying the customer and an indication of

the electronic storage facility containing the customer information (col. 1, lines 5-18)

With respect to claim 28, Walker teaches wherein said cross-referencing

comprises cross-referencing the assigned identifier with the identifying information

identifying the customer and an indication of the electronic storage facility containing the

customer information for the first and second data records (the CPO database identifies

the customer by name (primary passenger name), and by identification number

(customer ID) and identifies any companion passengers. The ID number stored in

companion passengers is preferably utilized to cross-reference the corresponding

information stored for the customer in the customer database (see fig. 9a, item 935, 940

and 945, col. 15, lines 12-17).

With respect to claim 29, Walker in view of SEHR teaches wherein said

determining step comprises comparing the identifying information in the first and second

data records to thereby determine whether the identifying information is for the same

customer (comparing with biometrics information that was previously stored in

the passenger card or in a remote database, to verify, for example, if a passenger is the

legitimate card holder: SEHR's paragraph's 0035, 0047 0049, 0062, 0066 and 0079).

With respect to claim 32, Walker in view of SEHR teaches wherein said providing step provides a mass data store comprising a plurality of data records, wherein some of the data records are for the same customer but stored in different electronic storage facilities, where the electronic storage facilities use the same customer identifier (SEHR's paragraph's 0035, 0047 0049, 0062, 0066 and 0079).

With respect to claim 33, Walker teaches wherein the customer information is travel-related information (abstract, fig. 1 and col. 5, lines 8-35).

Claim 34 is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 27 hereinabove.

Claim 35 is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 28 hereinabove.

Claim 36 is essentially the same as claim 29 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 29 hereinabove.

Claim 40 is essentially the same as claim 33 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 33 hereinabove.

Claim 41 is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 27 hereinabove.

Claim 42 is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 28 hereinabove.

Claim 43 is essentially the same as claim 29 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 29 hereinabove.

Claim 47 is essentially the same as claim 33 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 33 hereinabove.

8.   Claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-16, 21, 30-31, 37-39 and 44-46 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.: 6,134,534 issued to Walker et

al. (hereinafter Walker) in view of Pub. No. US 2002/0100802 A1 to SEHR (Provisional

Application No.: 60/050,648, filed on Jun 24, 1997 and further in view of US Patent No.:

7,281,168 B1 issued to Coates et al. (hereinafter Coates).

With respect to claims 3 and 30, Walker in view of SEHR discloses a method for

sharing customer information among a plurality of electronic storage facilities as

discussed in claims 1 and 25.

Walker and SEHR disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Walker and SEHR do not teach wherein identifying information

includes a storage identifier to identify an electronic storage facility transmitting

identifying information, a customer identifier for identifying customer information in the

electronic storage facility.

However, Coates teaches the storage cluster consists of distributed object

storage managers ("DOSMs") 320 and intelligent storage nodes the storage center

includes a plurality of distributed object storage managers (DOSMs) and a storage

cluster that includes a plurality of intelligent storage nodes. the DOSM file lookup table

stores, in the file identification column, the 128 bit string, with the file designation "MD5."

The second column of the DOSM file lookup table stores the IP address of the

intelligent storage node that stores the object file (e.g., "10.3.100.1"). The third column,

labeled disk ID, stores an integer value that identifies the specific disk drive on the

intelligent storage node that stores the object file. The customer ID is a network storage

system identifier used to uniquely identify the client. The customer name is the real

name associated with a customer. For the first example entry in the customer table,

"customer A" has a customer ID of "1." The customer reserved fields provide storage

reserved for use by the client. The customer ID, the same customer ID stored in the

customer table, uniquely identifies the client. For the example entries in folder table, the

customer ID of "3" identifies that the folders have been assigned to "customer C." The

folder ID identifies the specific folder for that entry: abstract, and figs. 6, 7 and 12, col. 7,

lines 1-25, col. 11, lines 12-54 and col. 15, lines 15-57). Thus, identifying information

includes: Disk ID or Folder ID is storage identifier, customer ID is for identifying

customer information and also, metadata is information/data related to identifying

customer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Walker in view of SEHR with

the teachings of Coates by incorporating the use of identifying information containing

customer ID, Disk ID or folder ID and metadata data as disclosed (fig. 12), into the

system of Walker for the purpose of enabling the systems to locate and access directly

these types of storages (Coates's col. 2, lines 12-25).

With respect to claim 4, Walker teaches wherein customer data includes a

customer's name and address (col. 14, lines 10-16).

Claim 9 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a computer

rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3

hereinabove.

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a computer rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 15 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 21 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 31, Walker in view of SEHR teaches wherein said determining step comprises comparing the customer data in the first and second data records to thereby determine whether the identifying information is for the same customer (comparing with biometrics information that was previously stored in the passenger card or in a remote database, to verify, for example, if a passenger is the legitimate card holder: SEHR's paragraph's 0035, 0047 0049, 0062, 0066 and 0079).

With respect to claim 37, Walker in view of SEHR and Coates teaches wherein identifying information includes a storage identifier to identify an electronic storage facility comprising the customer information and a customer identifier for identifying

customer information in the electronic storage facility (Coates' figs. 6, 7 and 12, col. 7, lines 1-25, col. 11, lines 12-54 and col. 15, lines 15-57).

With respect to claim 38, Walker in view of SEHR teaches, wherein said determining comprises comparing the customer data in the first and second data records to thereby determine whether the identifying information is for the same customer (SEHR's paragraph's 0035, 0047 0049, 0062, 0066 and 0079).

With respect to claim 39, Walker in view of SEHR teaches, wherein said mass data store comprises a plurality of data records, wherein some of the data records are for the same customer but stored in different electronic storage facilities, where the electronic storage facilities use the same customer identifier (SEHR's paragraph's 0035, 0047 0049, 0062, 0066 and 0079).

Claim 44 is essentially the same as claim 37 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a computer, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 37 hereinabove.

Claim 45 is essentially the same as claim 38 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a computer, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 38 hereinabove.

Claim 46 is essentially the same as claim 39 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a computer, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 39 hereinabove.

Contact Information

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ANH LY whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or

via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV **or fax to (571) 273-4039**. The examiner can

normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **John Breene**, can be reached on (571) 272-4107.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see **http://pair-direct.uspto.gov**. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed

to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to:

Central Fax Center **(571) 273-8300**

JEAN FLEURANTIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANH LY
FEB. 28th, 2008